



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,253	02/06/2004	Mikko Nurmi	KOLS.094PA	8645
7590 Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC Suite 125 8009 34th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55425			EXAMINER SHAPIRO, LEONID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/774,253	Applicant(s) NURMI, MIKKO	
	Examiner Leonid Shapiro	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 10-13 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-9 and 14-18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5-23-05, 9-21-04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1-2, 10-11, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. (US Patent No. 6,835,013 B2) in view of Bary et al (Pub. No.: US 2004/0158429 A1).

As to claim 1, Dunn et al. teaches a method of editing a character string displayed on a touchscreen with an indicator means (See Fig. 1, item 106, from Col. 2, Line 66 to Col. 3, Line 25) , the method comprising:

displaying, on the touchscreen, at least one character string comprising a plurality of characters (See Fig. 5, items 206, 210, 212); and

editing the character string that characters are deleted from the character string (See Fig. 5, items 206, 210, 212, Col. 7, Lines 1-4).

Dunn et al. does not disclose the indicator means such that the characters after the indication point are deleted from the character string.

Barry et al. teaches the indicator means such that the characters after the indication point are deleted from the character string (See paragraphs 0196-0197).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate teachings of Barry et al. into Dunn et al. system in order to

Art Unit: 2629

correlate the content issues with the traffic data (See paragraph 0025 in the Bary et al. reference).

As to claims 10,19-20 Dunnet al. teaches an electronic device (See Fig. 1, item 106, from Col. 2, Line 66 to Col. 3, Line 25) comprising:

a touchscreen, on which touchscreen the device is configured to display at least one character string comprising a plurality of characters (See Fig. 5, items 206,210,212); and

means for editing the character string that characters are deleted from the character string (See Fig. 5, items 206,210,212, Col. 7, Lines 1-4).

Dunn et al. does not disclose the indicator means such that the characters after the indication point are deleted from the character string.

Barry et al. teaches the indicator means such that the characters after the indication point are deleted from the character string (See paragraphs 0196-0197).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate teachings of Barry et al. into Dunn et al. system in order to correlate the content issues with the traffic data (See paragraph 0025 in the Bary et al. reference).

As to claims 2,11,21 Bary et al. teaches character string being a network address displayed in an address field of a browser program (See paragraphs 0196-0197).

3. Claims 3,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. and Bary et al. as applied to claims 2,11 above, and further in view of Birrell (US Patent No. 6,470,027).

As to claims 3,12 Dunn et al. and Bary et al. do not disclose initiating automatically the loading of the network address according to the edited character string by said browser program in response to the editing of the character string.

Birrell teaches initiating automatically the loading of the network address according to the edited character string by said browser program in response to the editing of the character string (See Fig. 1, from Col. 2, Line 56 to Col. 3 Line 43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of Birrell into Dunn et al. and Bary et al. system in order to redirect web page (See Col. 2, Lines 9-17 in the Birrell reference).

4. Claims 4,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. and Bary et al. as applied to claims 2,11 above, and further in view of Iwata (JP 02-204848 A).

As to claims 3,12 Dunn et al. and Bary et al. do not disclose displaying said character string in the address field of the browser program based on predictive address entry.

Iwata teaches translating said character string in the address field of the browser program based on predictive address entry (See Costitution).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of Iwata into Dunn et al. and Bary et al. system in update translation predicting means (See Purpose in the Iwata reference).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 5-9,14-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Relative to claim 5,14 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Bary et al., Dunn et al. and Birrell) and the instant invention is that the touchscreen is configured to identify the duration of the indication in relation to a predetermined limit value, the method further comprising initiating said automatic loading of the network address in response to the duration of the indication exceeding the predetermined limit value.

Claims 8 and 17 depend on claims 5 and 14.

Relative to claim 6,15 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Bary et al., Dunn et al. and Birrell) and the instant invention is that the touchscreen is configured to identify the direction of movement of the indication in relation to a predetermined limit value, the method further comprising initiating said automatic loading of the network address in response to the direction of movement of the indication being within the limits set by the predetermined limit value.

Claims 7,9 and 16,18 depend on claims 6 and 15.


Telephone Inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 571-272-7683. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LS
12.12.06



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600